

2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting

UN-OCHA



2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – UN-OCHA

Contents

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Work stream 1 - Transparency | 4 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 4 |
| 2. Progress to date | 4 |
| 3. Planned next steps | 6 |
| 4. Efficiency gains | 7 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned | 7 |
| Work stream 2 - Localization | 9 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 9 |
| 2. Progress to date | 10 |
| 3. Planned next steps | 13 |
| 4. Efficiency gains | 13 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned | 13 |
| Work stream 3 - Cash | 14 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 14 |
| 2. Progress to date | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 3. Planned next steps | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4. Efficiency gains | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Work stream 4 – Management costs | 18 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 19 |
| 2. Progress to date | 19 |
| 3. Planned next steps | 20 |
| 4. Efficiency gains | 20 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned | 20 |
| Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment..... | 20 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 22 |
| 2. Progress to date..... | 22 |
| 3. Planned next steps | 23 |
| 4. Efficiency gains | 23 |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned | 24 |
| Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution | 25 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 25 |
| 2. Progress to date | 25 |
| 3. Planned next steps | 26 |
| 4. Efficiency gains | 27 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned | 28 |
| Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding | 25 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 29 |
| 2. Progress to date | 29 |
| 3. Planned next steps | 30 |
| 4. Efficiency gains | 31 |
| 5. Good practice and lessons learned | 31 |
| Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility | 32 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 32 |
| 2. Progress to date | 33 |
| 3. Planned next steps | 33 |
| 4. Efficiency gains | 34 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned | 34 |
| Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements | 35 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 35 |
| 2. Progress to date | 35 |
| 3. Planned next steps | 35 |
| 4. Efficiency gains | 36 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned | 36 |
| Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement..... | 37 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1)..... | 37 |
| 2. Progress to date | 37 |
| 3. Planned next steps | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4. Efficiency gains | 38 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned | 38 |

Work stream 1 - Transparency

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Publish timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding within two years of the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul. We consider IATI to provide a basis for the purpose of a common standard.*
2. *Make use of appropriate data analysis, explaining the distinctiveness of activities, organisations, environments and circumstances (for example, protection, conflict-zones).*
3. *Improve the digital platform and engage with the open-data standard community to help ensure:*
 - *accountability of donors and responders with open data for retrieval and analysis;*
 - *improvements in decision-making, based upon the best possible information;*
 - *a reduced workload over time as a result of donors accepting common standard data for some reporting purposes; and*
 - *traceability of donors' funding throughout the transaction chain as far as the final responders and, where feasible, affected people.*
4. *Support the capacity of all partners to access and publish data.*

Transparency work stream co-conveners reporting request: How will you use the data from IATI within your organization including, for example, for monitoring, reporting and vis-à-vis other Grand Bargain commitments?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

See year 1 report

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

Financial Tracking System:

Enhancing transparency through FTS is critically important for measuring progress toward many other commitments made at the WHS. To track funding to local actors, FTS now has the capability to trace pass-through funding flows through multiple levels of implementing partners. New data visualisations in the form of Sankey and Dendrogram diagrams have also been added which provide an alternative and visually richer way of conveying flow data.

The new FTS can now also tag cash-transfer programming and track multi-year funding, features that the old FTS did not have. FTS has also finalized an IATI ingestion module and

plans to develop guidelines for reporting in IATI standard and work with a selected partner who will act as a pilot case to report in 2018. The aim is to foster active support for the widespread adoption of the IATI standard. A background paper which answers key questions about the purpose and functionality of the IATI standard and FTS has been produced in support of the work of the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task team and distributed among partners and more widely to all FTS users through the website. Given the challenges that partners have encountered in adopting the IATI standard or adapting it to report humanitarian funding to FTS, the promotion of IATI and support to partners will be an ongoing task which will take place through the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task team and bilateral meetings.

To match the newly available technical capabilities, FTS is currently conducting outreach with reporting partners and other stakeholders to ensure the submission of comprehensive funding flow data. FTS is receiving and processing funding flow data on pass-through contributions, multi-year awards, and cash-transfer programs and expects that reporting on this data to grow significantly over the next two years.

Work on the HPC tools has continued in the form of further developments and roll out of the RPM. In addition, a replacement for the OPS was developed and piloted in 2 countries. Some of the features in the new platform include linking projects to cluster frameworks and caseloads which join the dots between the needs, response planning and subsequent monitoring. The new OPS is part of the integrated database behind the FTS system which will further enhance tracking once the roll out is complete. Further enhancements on the new OPS are also expected in 2018 subject to financial constraints. The roll out of these applications means that more data will become available and can be used in future to draw linkages for analysis and reporting and strengthen the evidence base as well as transparency.

Central Emergency Response Fund:

Between January and December 2017 CERF has continued to publish core CERF data directly in the IATI Standard and provided financial data on grants approved and contributions received to the initiative of the Joint Funding Task Team (JFTT) of the UNDG Fiduciary Management Oversight Group (FMOG).

In May 2017, the CERF secretariat published the first ever CERF results report, which includes information on the numbers of people who received CERF-funded assistance at the global, regional and allocation levels. A chart on the first pages of the report illustrates the flow of CERF funds from donors, through CERF and onwards to agencies who implemented life-saving projects across 13 sectors in support of people in need in 45 countries. The report also provides an overview of CERF's strategic added value to humanitarian operations at the country level as reported by RC/HCs. The report represents a major step forward in CERF's accountability and reporting on its performance in line with the commitment to greater transparency. The report is freely accessible on the CERF website.

CERF continues to prepare and publish an annual analysis of the involvement of UN agencies' implementing partners in the delivery of CERF funded humanitarian action. The report includes a detailed analysis of the flow of CERF funds through recipient UN agencies to their implementing partners.

In late 2017, CERF transitioned to a new website with the aim of enabling easier access to relevant data, publications and guidance material for recipient agencies, CERF's donors, potential donors and the general public.

Country Based Pooled Funds:

OCHA continued to maintain and upgrade its public Business Intelligence (BI) portal available at <https://gms.unocha.org/content/cbpf-contributions>, which provides easy access to contribution and allocation data and trends for all Funds in real time, which can be retrieved by users for further analysis. The BI portal includes an overview of CBPF funding against each country's Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), broken down by type of implementing partner, clusters, and number of targeted and reached project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender and age.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

OCHA has invested significantly in strengthening systems to provide accurate, reliable, up-to-date information to global stakeholders, including affected people. In support of advancing the Grand Bargain 'Transparency' components, FTS will continue working on the following areas:

Continue to improve the FTS platform's technical capabilities, including through the development of upgrades and new features on the FTS website.

The availability of a website necessitates ongoing maintenance and upgrades, and this work will continue the FTS website. New features such as whole pages, charts or data tables will be identified through user feedback and discussion with partners in bilateral meetings or forums such as the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team. Where any of these items have been identified to support the Grand Bargain transparency commitments, they will then be appropriately prioritised and developed. Improved visibility on multi-year funding, transactions costs, donor earmarking and private contributions remain key areas for future technical improvements.

Maintain and improve the FTS data curation and aggregation service and provide continuously updated information on humanitarian funding flows.

This is a continuous workstream to invest in communication and outreach to ensure wider participation from currently under-represented stakeholders, especially new donors, NGOs and the private sector, but also to continue support existing reporting partners in improving their reporting practices. Furthermore, closer cooperation and analysis will be needed with stakeholders involved with work on the Humanitarian Development Nexus to ensure timely and reliable disaggregation and reporting of humanitarian related data.

Integrate FTS into a new suite of information services to improve links between needs, planning, monitoring, and funding information to provide a stronger evidence base for strategic decision making. These links will improve financial transparency and support enhanced transparency throughout the entire humanitarian programme cycle.

The new FTS website has been built as an integrated part of a larger database which also supports the HPC suite of applications. The HPC suite includes systems like the RPM and the new replacement for OPS. The integrated nature of the database will open up new avenues for linking these sets of data together and producing new outputs and reports via an online viewer, which is currently being developed and scheduled for release in 2018. Additional work will be needed to draw these links where possible, and to then support and encourage partners in data collection and reporting.

Develop guidelines for organization's using the IATI standard to report to FTS, and initiate a pilot program to provide bespoke support to organizations upgrading their systems to adapt and report humanitarian funding through the IATI standard

Further work will be done to improve the IATI ingestion module to refine the data extraction and curation process in conjunction with the work to encourage partners to report using the IATI standard. The latter of this work also involves completing and publishing a best practices guide for using IATI to report information to the FTS system.

CERF and CBPF:

OCHA is planning to develop a single Business Intelligence (BI) portal for CERF and CBPFs. As part of the Grand Bargain efforts to increase transparency in aid delivery and in addition to the regular publication of CERF financial information (grants and contributions) on the CERF website, the FTS and IATI, CERF will continue to provide financial data on grants approved and contributions received to the initiative of the Joint Funding Task Team (JFTT) of the UNDG Fiduciary Management Oversight Group (FMOG), aiming at compiling, analysing and publishing financial data from all UN inter-agency pooled funds.

In early 2018, CERF will work on improving the CERF results report with better data analysis and more detailed information on specific topics. For example, to strengthen its gender-focused analysis, the CERF secretariat plans to include a specific section on gender in CERF-funded projects. To reach a more targeted product that serves the informational needs of its users, the CERF secretariat will gather and incorporate feedback from donors, recipient UN agencies and other stakeholders.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

OCHA, stakeholders (particularly donors), and partners will be able to rely on the accuracy and relevance of CERF and CBPF data available on the BI portal and FTS, reducing reporting times and workloads in the field and at the global level, and enabling users to retrieve/download information for further analysis.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

The CERF secretariat received overwhelmingly positive feedback for the publication of the CERF results report. Information in the shape of charts or tables that traced funding from donors through CERF on to UN agencies and to sectors was particularly appreciated as was the presentation of consolidated succinct information on CERF allocation rationales and data on people reached. Donors explained that the report served them well as a reference work and in communicating their engagement to their national audience.

Work stream 2 – Localization

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase and support multi-year investment in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including preparedness, response and coordination capacities, especially in fragile contexts and where communities are vulnerable to armed conflicts, disasters, recurrent outbreaks and the effects of climate change. We should achieve this through collaboration with development partners and incorporate capacity strengthening in partnership agreements.*
2. *Understand better and work to remove or reduce barriers that prevent organisations and donors from partnering with local and national responders in order to lessen their administrative burden.*
3. *Support and complement national coordination mechanisms where they exist and include local and national responders in international coordination mechanisms as appropriate and in keeping with humanitarian principles.*
4. *Achieve by 2020 a global, aggregated target of at least 25 per cent of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible to improve outcomes for affected people and reduce transactional costs.*
5. *Develop, with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), and apply a 'localisation' marker to measure direct and indirect funding to local and national responders.*
6. *Make greater use of funding tools which increase and improve assistance delivered by local and national responders, such as UN-led country-based pooled funds (CBPF), IFRC Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) and NGO-led and other pooled funds.*

Localisation work stream co-conveners reporting request: What percentage of your humanitarian funding in 2017 was provided to local and national responders (a) directly (b) through pooled funds, or (c) through a single intermediary?¹

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Coordination:

Prior to the signing of the Grand Bargain, OCHA-Inter Cluster Coordination Section (ICCS) provided remote and in field advice and support to field offices on coordination architecture

¹ The "Identified Categories for Tracking Aid Flows" document agreed through silence procedure ([available here](#)) provides relevant definitions. The detailed data collection form ([available here](#)) may also assist you in responding to this question. Returning this form with your self report is optional, but encouraged.

in general, and, where appropriate, advocated for strengthened ties with local and national actors such as governments and NGOs in coordination settings.

In terms of coordination, National NGOs are on average the largest participant type in clusters. In 2014, 61% HCTs had national NGO representation – in 2016, over 72% of HCTs have national NGOs represented. With respect to coordination with national authorities, in 2016 53% of clusters are co-led with a government partner at national level.

In 2017, CBPFs received \$824 million from 26 Member States, breaking again the record amount channelled through these funds, which however still represented only 5 per cent of the sum of HRP funding requirements for the 18 countries that had a CBPF (\$15.7 billion). In 2017, CBPFs allocated \$683 million, of which \$163.5 million (24%) were directly allocated to national NGOs; surpassing the net and percentage amount recorded in the previous two years (CBPF allocations to national NGOs in 2015 totalled \$74.06, and in 2016 \$133.34 million).

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

Following the World Humanitarian Summit, OCHA identified several action points internally and some with inter-agency groups to which it provides secretariat support. Below are key issues where progress has been made:

Coordination:

1. The policy debate around localization is broader than this, however, as demonstrated by the important conversations that have been organized in 2017 at Wilton Park and the Global Humanitarian Action Forum in London. OCHA is currently in the process of reviewing the initiatives and discussions around local humanitarian action that have taken place since the World Humanitarian Summit, with a view to unpacking, from a policy perspective, where the key issues, gaps and tensions lie and how OCHA can add the most value to this debate going forward. OCHA is in the process of developing an internal strategy on local action and the implications of the current debate for the different components of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle. The paper highlights OCHA's role in catalysing change in local action through preparedness, response and transition phases to ensure local actors have the capacity and resources to respond to disasters and ensure international assistance is available, where and when it is needed to respect national actors' role as primary responders while recognizing that international assistance is essential in some cases particularly protection crises.

In 2018, OCHA will continue holding internal and external discussions on specific topics emerging from the current debate which OCHA may have a role to address in partnership with other key stakeholders, including funding for local actors; building and understanding the capacity of local actors; coordination and collaboration; and localization and the humanitarian principles.

2. A tip sheet on localization for clusters and coordination bodies was produced in collaboration with GCCG. The objective of the tip sheet was to provide advice and ideas to ensure contextualized coordination systems and recognize the leadership and resources of local actors. This tip sheet is publicly available on [HRinfo: https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/coordination/clusters/global-cluster-coordinators-group-initiatives-0](https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/coordination/clusters/global-cluster-coordinators-group-initiatives-0)
3. A tip sheet for OCHA internal use on how OCHA offices can further work with local actors and ensure local action takes place as close to operations as possible drafted.
4. GCCG review of the IASC Guidance on Engagement with National Authorities took place with a decision not to pursue an update.
5. GCCG inputs on localization were facilitated and provided into the Minimum and Advanced Preparedness Actions review
5. Data collected on national actor leadership in coordination arrangements through Coordination Description Mapping.
6. Represented OCHA in the IFRC-Switzerland-led Localization Workstream and provided inputs into the workplan and engaged in the actions on localization
7. Supported Christian Aid-led project on accelerating localization and facilitated discussions with South Sudan, Myanmar and Nigeria country offices.
8. Organized a session on localization in coordination settings at the December 2017 New York Global Humanitarian Policy Forum discussing with national actors the future of humanitarian action and their role

Financing:

Grand Bargain signatories agreed to develop and apply a 'localisation marker', together with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), to measure direct and indirect funding to local and national actors. The IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team (HFTT) set up a 'Localisation Marker Working Group' in July 2016 to take this work forward, co-convened by CAFOD, OCHA and Development Initiatives. Participation in the group is open to HFTT and non-HFTT members, and includes the Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR), national NGOs, donors and independent experts.

The Localisation Marker Working Group quickly established that to design an effective localisation marker, the following questions first needed to be resolved:

- 'What is a local or national actor' – to whom does the 25% target apply?
- What does the term 'as directly as possible' mean in practice?

A process was set in place to discuss and agree on a set of definitions that would answer the above questions, led by Development Initiatives (DI) as an independent organization without

a vested interest in the outcome. Following a mapping of the various definitions of local and national actors currently used by different organisations and groups, and an assessment of the feasibility of tracking direct and indirect funding to local and national organisations, an initial set of definitions was circulated for comment in November 2016. The group discussed the definitions paper on several occasions; it was revised and discussed again at an expanded session at the IASC HFTT retreat in January 2017; and at a meeting of the Good Humanitarian Donorship work stream on localisation in February 2017.

To encourage local and national actors to contribute to the process, the working group designed, tested and disseminated an online survey on the definitions in English, French and Arabic. More than 380 individuals responded to the survey from 71 different countries during March 2017, approximately two thirds of whom categorized themselves as working with national or local organisations. The survey was applied to a large constituency of national and international NGOs as a means of engaging civil society and front line responding organisations in the field in this exercise. Respondents (384) largely agreed with the proposed definitions (agreement ratings varied from 81% to 91%) and provided useful suggestions for how the definitions could be improved.

Between June and November of 2017, the IASC HFTT Localisation Marker Working Group worked closely with the co-conveners of the localisation work stream of the Grand Bargain, IFRC and Switzerland, in seeking the endorsement of definitions among the Grand Bargain signatories. In line with the definitions produced by the IASC HFTT Localisation Marker Working Group, the co-conveners formulated and circulated for endorsement definitions of 'local actors', as well as categories of "direct" and "direct as possible funding" which the signatories approved first through a silence procedure in June and a subsequent one in November 2017.

The work was completed and is published on the IASC website, available here: <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/humanitarian-financing-task-team/documents-public/hfft-localisation-marker-definitions-paper-24>

In 2017, CERF's Grants Management Systems (CERF GMS) was expanded with a new module allowing data on sub-grants and implementing partners to be stored in a database for easier reporting and analysis.

The CERF secretariat completed another round of sub-grants analysis, this one covering grants made in 2015. The results showed that 26% of CERF funding (\$120 million) was sub-granted by UN agencies to implementing partners, an increase of \$14 million compared with the preceding year. More than half of this amount, \$62 million, went to 505 national and local partners in 45 countries. (320 National NGOs, 161 Government entities, 24 Red Cross/Red Crescent societies). This represents an unparalleled global reach that would be difficult to achieve for CERF or CERF's donors through direct funding agreements. These amounts do not include the value of in-kind support in the form of relief supplies procured by UN agencies with CERF funds.

In May 2017, the CERF secretariat also prepared a discussion paper exploring possible opportunities, challenges and implications of more direct NGO access to CERF. The paper was discussed with ICVA and with the CERF Advisory Group.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

As part of the functional review process in OCHA, we look forward to a renewed engagement in the issue of localization.

Next steps include adopting the definitions endorsed by GB signatories and further described in the IASC HFTT Localization Marker Working Group paper in the FTS and other tracking systems. In addition, IFRC and Switzerland will continue to promote a baseline exercise among GB signatories to start reporting the volume of funding channelled directly and “as directly” as possible to local organizations.

In 2018, CERF will continue its systematic tracking, analysis and publishing of data and information on the involvement of local and national responders in delivering CERF-funded humanitarian action and will include a related section in its annual Results Report. Likewise, CERF will continue to work with UN agencies and NGO consortia to promote effective and efficient partnerships under CERF grants.

In addition, achieving a \$1 billion CERF, a goal endorsed by the General Assembly in December 2016, will be a major focus of work for the CERF secretariat. Doubling CERF – as included in the Agenda for Humanity – would, at a minimum, proportionally increase the amount of funds available for implementation by frontline NGO responders in partnership with the UN.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

As a non-implementing agency, OCHA does not have specific measurable indicators related to this.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

The engagement with the global clusters to develop a practical tip sheet has added more practical support and inter-agency engagement.

Work stream 3 – Cash

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Increase the routine use of cash alongside other tools, including in-kind assistance, service delivery (such as health and nutrition) and vouchers. Employ markers to measure increase and outcomes.*
- 2. Invest in new delivery models which can be increased in scale while identifying best practice and mitigating risks in each context. Employ markers to track their evolution.*
- 3. Build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash (including on protection) relative to in-kind assistance, service delivery interventions and vouchers, and combinations thereof.*
- 4. Collaborate, share information and develop standards and guidelines for cash programming in order to better understand its risks and benefits.*
- 5. Ensure that coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers.*
- 6. Aim to increase use of cash programming beyond current low levels, where appropriate. Some organisations and donors may wish to set targets.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

See year 1 report

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

In progress towards the Grand Bargain commitments, OCHA convened an internal Grand Bargain workstream with 5 commitments² (as outlined last year).

In cooperation with cluster lead agencies and fellow GB signatories, OCHA has continued to convene a Global Cluster Coordinators Group Task Team on cash. This task team supported the recommendations outlined in the World Bank Strategic Note regarding cash coordination. The responsibility for coordinating cash has now been fully integrated into the revised inter-cluster coordinators group terms of reference in late 2017.

² Ensuring that cash transfer programming is fully integrated into coordination systems; joint/coordination multi-sectoral assessments including joint market and response analysis for MPC; joint feasibility as part of preparedness efforts' coordinating CTP responses designed to link to national social protection systems; and, ensuring CERF and CBPF are 'cash ready' to facilitate multi-sector CTP delivery.

The coordination of cash including multi-purpose cash is included as a function at the inter-cluster level and the TORs recommend that cash working groups (CWGs) become sub-groups of the overall inter-cluster.

OCHA has also continue to ensure that cash is fully integrated into coordination systems. Based on a compiled mapping of 26 cash working groups, 20 of these working groups now have a formalised link to the inter-cluster³. OCHA is providing direct support (either via chair, co-chair or secretariat support) to at least 12 of these with additional contexts being reviewed throughout 2018 to engage further. Additionally, OCHA is providing information management support to 14 cash working groups.

Financing mechanisms continue to include cash modalities and multi-purpose cash. The CBPF has developed guidance on funding cash transfer programmes (CTP) and CERF continue to scale up their funding to cash projects, inclusive of multi-purpose cash. Tracking and tagging systems have also been updated in line with these improvements and the online project system (OPS) now contains breakdowns to track whether projects include conditions, restrictions and also where projects are multi-sectoral (inclusive of multi-purpose cash).

In March 2017, an online introduction and update for Cash Transfer Programming (CTP) was delivered to Country Pooled Fund Managers with the objectives to a) build a common understanding as to where OCHA stands in terms of multi-purpose cash (MPC) programming, and b) to establish a frequent exchange on this modality.

In August 2017, OCHA produced a brief “CBPF Guidance on Cash Transfer Programming”, outlining four minimum criteria for programming in the context of CBPFs, namely partner performance, cash feasibility, distribution of cash assistance, and monitoring and post-distribution monitoring (PDM). (This guidance was followed by OCHA’s Guidance “Integrating Cash-Transfer Programming into Coordination Systems and Processes”, published in September 2017.)

Throughout the year, CBPF managers further participated in multiple cash coordination group calls with UN Agencies (coordinated by WFP) relating to DFID’s performance-based results framework on cash programming. Joint, inter-agency cash feasibility projects have been conducted in 4 countries (as part of a DFID funded preparedness project). These tools have been replicated in two additional contexts using a lighter approach to understand the potential suitability of cash as a response modality. OCHA also participated in the ECHO funded project to support a scale up of multi-purpose cash. Finally, OCHA continues to co-chair the Geneva based Cash Working Group alongside CaLP and has trained over 50 staff from field, regional and HQ offices in the basics of cash coordination.

In 2017, CERF updated its application template to enable better tracking and analysis of CERF-funded cash-based interventions. The CERF grant management system now records the value of cash to be transferred to the beneficiary as well as parameters of the cash transfers (multipurpose/sector-specific, conditional/unconditional, restricted/unrestricted). CERF can

³ Either via explicit reference within the respective terms of reference or via a standing seat at the inter-cluster etc. Note that some of these groups without the formalised link to the ‘inter-cluster’ are coordinated within a refugee coordination model and may have a comparable link to the inter-sector where relevant.

link this information to other parameters such as agency, sector, country, region, emergency type and CERF window. The CERF secretariat has also started updating its guidance package for the field, including guidance on the Rapid Response and Underfunded Emergencies windows and cash programming.

The increased use of cash-based programming in humanitarian response is reflected in CERF grants requests. The proportion of CERF grants containing cash-based assistance increased to 15% of all CERF grants in 2017, the highest ever ratio. The corresponding proportions were 3% in 2014, 6% in 2015 and 10% in 2016.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

In its role as GCCG Cash Task Team lead, OCHA work with the task team to finalise the standardised TORs for CWGs and develop a standard, sector neutral cash coordination guidance⁴. OCHA will continue to adhere to the updated inter-cluster terms of reference and ensure that all CWGs are predictably and sustainably linked to the inter-cluster and formal coordination architecture.

In terms of cash tracking, CBPF section is already capturing cash programming/cash components in projects through its online-based CBPF Grant Management System (GMS) and as part of the CBPF Common Performance Framework (CPF). OCHA is currently working on tracking and filtering this modality in a more systematic and targeted fashion, aiming for the system to filter and generate cash programming data on previously and currently implemented projects and by partner type (UN Agencies, INGOs, NNGOs). As this system adjustment is quite a technical process, the development of this feature is likely to still take a few months, yet, with confidence that it will be implemented in 2018.

A full analysis of cash programming in the context of CBPFs, therefore, will depend on system development and data provided by the respective Humanitarian Financing Units (HFUs) in the field. On the longer term, OCHA aims to reflect cash project data in its public Business Intelligence in future (www.gms.unocha.org/bi). Any GMS adjustment will be accompanied with briefings and online trainings to the Fund Managers and/or Humanitarian Financing Unit's (HFU) staff members.

In early 2018, the CERF reporting template will be updated to mirror the information that is recorded through the application template. This will enable CERF to track detailed data on *funded* cash-based interventions as well as those currently *implemented*. In addition, the CERF secretariat plans to share an updated guidance for partners to improve understanding on eligibility of cash-based interventions.

⁴ With support from CashCap and CaLP to develop the document

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

As a non-implementing partner, OCHA remains committed to ensuring effectiveness in humanitarian responses by providing an enabling environment for cash transfer scale up.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Agreement and practical interpretation of the World Bank led strategic note via the global cluster task team has resulted several coordination workstreams moving forward and a more predictable and supportive approach for strategic cash coordination in the field.

Work stream 4 – Management costs

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Reduce the costs and measure the gained efficiencies of delivering assistance with technology (including green) and innovation. Aid organisations will provide the detailed steps to be taken by the end of 2017.*

Examples where use of technology can be expanded:

- Mobile technology for needs assessments/post-distribution monitoring;*
 - Digital platforms and mobile devices for financial transactions;*
 - Communication with affected people via call centres and other feedback mechanisms such as SMS text messaging;*
 - Biometrics; and*
 - Sustainable energy.*
- 2. Harmonise partnership agreements and share partner assessment information as well as data about affected people, after data protection safeguards have been met by the end of 2017, in order to save time and avoid duplication in operations.*

Aid organisations commit to:

- 3. Provide transparent and comparable cost structures by the end of 2017. We acknowledge that operational management of the Grand Bargain signatories - the United Nations, International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and the NGO sector may require different approaches.*
- 4. Reduce duplication of management and other costs through maximising efficiencies in procurement and logistics for commonly required goods and services. Shared procurement should leverage the comparative advantage of the aid organisations and promote innovation.*

Suggested areas for initial focus:

- Transportation/Travel;*
- Vehicles and fleet management;*
- Insurance;*
- Shipment tracking systems;*
- Inter-agency/common procurement pipelines (non-food items, shelter, WASH, food);*
- IT services and equipment;*
- Commercial consultancies; and*
- Common support services.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.*
-

Management costs work stream co-conveners reporting request: What steps have you taken to reduce the number of individual donor assessments (if a donor) or partner assessments (if an agency) you conduct on humanitarian partners?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

See year 1 report

2. Progress to date

A reduction of the UN Secretariat Programme Support Cost (PSC) from 3 to 2 per cent for OCHA-managed pooled funds, granted on 24 February 2016 and taking effect on 1 June 2016, will free up US\$6.5 million by CERF and CBPFs on current funding levels. This translates into more funds allocated to humanitarian action, improves the Funds' overall efficiency, potentially attracting more donor funds, and encouraging reforms in other areas. For OCHA, PSC has already been reduced from 13 to 7 per cent. In support of advancing the Grand Bargain 'Management Costs' components, OCHA further commits to:

- Continuing support to initiatives that increase efficiency through expanding common services and procurement (common core pipelines, telecommunication, logistics, information management and monitoring) and ensuring full transparency in the management and collective prioritisation of such services, including through its leadership role in inter-cluster coordination.
- Continuing to invest in existing systems and tools such as the CBPF and CERF Grants Management Systems to ensure overall efficiency and transparency in pooled-fund management.

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

OCHA harmonized and simplified the partner capacity assessment (PCA) methodology applied by CBPFs to NGO implementing partners, which includes a PCA module on GMS. Full implementation of the harmonized PCA approach is started in 2017.

In 2016, based on best practices, OCHA harmonized and simplified the partner capacity assessment (PCA) methodology applied by CBPFs to NGO implementing partners, which includes a PCA module on GMS (CBPF global guidelines launched in 2015 included 3 different approaches to PCAs). Full implementation of the harmonized PCA approach is expected in 2017.

OCHA CBPF (see localization workstream) is also engaged in broader PCA harmonization initiatives and will therefore continue to consider opportunities to further simplify or adjust the PCA process, as well as to contribute to collective efforts in this area that could reduce burden and duplication for donors, UN agencies, and NGO partners.

In 2016 OCHA (with support from CBPF donors) changed the arrangement to cover the management costs of CBPFs. Therefore, as of last year, Humanitarian Financing Units (HFUs) have a separate cost plan that is directly covered by the CBPF (instead of OCHA's budget). This change stabilized the capacity and resources necessary to manage all CBPFs according to operational and contextual needs.

The reduction of the UN Secretariat Programme Support Cost (PSC) from 3 to 2 per cent negotiated by OCHA-managed pooled funds in 2016, freed up approximately US\$4.2 million of CERF funding and \$6.9 million of CBPF funding for additional programming in 2017.

In 2017, CERF implemented new features in the CERF GMS (regarding, inter alia, upload of application data and automation of reporting processes) that have led to great efficiency gains and improvement of data accuracy and quality.

CERF supported common humanitarian services, including amongst others logistics, air service, safety and security, and telecommunications, with a total of \$15.2 million in 2017, thereby promoting more efficient support systems, processes and approaches.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

OCHA CBPF engaged in broader PCA harmonization initiatives pursuing system-wide opportunities to further simplify or adjust the PCA principles, systems and process, as well as to contribute to collective efforts in this area that could reduce burden and duplication for donors, UN agencies, and NGO partners. In this regard, OCHA CBPF commissioned a study in collaboration with ICVA to explore efficiency gains related to PCAs focused on two country studies, Turkey (for the Syria response) and Somalia. The report is due to be published in Q1 of 2018.

4. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

1. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Provide a single, comprehensive, cross-sectoral, methodologically sound and impartial overall assessment of needs for each crisis to inform strategic decisions on how to respond and fund thereby reducing the number of assessments and appeals produced by individual organisations.*
- 2. Coordinate and streamline data collection to ensure compatibility, quality and comparability and minimising intrusion into the lives of affected people. Conduct the overall assessment in a transparent, collaborative process led by the Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator with full involvement of the Humanitarian Country Team and the clusters/sectors and in the case of sudden onset disasters, where possible, by the government. Ensure sector-specific assessments for operational planning are undertaken under the umbrella of a coordinated plan of assessments at inter-cluster/sector level.*
- 3. Share needs assessment data in a timely manner, with the appropriate mitigation of protection and privacy risks. Jointly decide on assumptions and analytical methods used for projections and estimates.*
- 4. Dedicate resources and involve independent specialists within the clusters to strengthen data collection and analysis in a fully transparent, collaborative process, which includes a brief summary of the methodological and analytical limitations of the assessment.*
- 5. Prioritise humanitarian response across sectors based on evidence established by the analysis. As part of the IASC Humanitarian Response Plan process on the ground, it is the responsibility of the empowered Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator to ensure the development of the prioritised, evidence-based response plans.*
- 6. Commission independent reviews and evaluations of the quality of needs assessment findings and their use in prioritisation to strengthen the confidence of all stakeholders in the needs assessment.*
- 7. Conduct risk and vulnerability analysis with development partners and local authorities, in adherence to humanitarian principles, to ensure the alignment of humanitarian and development programming.*

Needs assessment work stream co-conveners reporting request: What hurdles, if any, might be addressed to allow for more effective implementation of the GB commitment?

As agreed with ECHO after the first workshop held in March 2017 with stakeholders engaged in this Workstream, OCHA and ECHO's role as co-conveners of the Needs Assessment Workstream had been understood as facilitators of priority activities identified with the group,

and to ensure coherence and inter-linkages within the Workstream and with other Workstreams. However, it has become clear that very few of the entities that committed to lead on the implementation or to collaborate on specific activities, did so. While reasons vary, the slow progress led OCHA to propose to play a more proactive role, including regular follow-up with the stakeholders during teleconferences and meetings to take stock and solve issues that may arise. After 6 months of suspension of involvement in the WS, ECHO appointed in January 2018 a new staff together a team for the Workstream and this additional capacity should help to re-energise the group so that they meet their commitments. On OCHA side, resources are stretched to play the expected lead role.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

See year 1 report

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

In March 2017, OCHA and ECHO organized the first Workshop of the Workstream stakeholders. A matrix identifying priority activities was jointly developed, including voluntary lead entities and contributing partners. OCHA drafted a Theory of Change for the Workstream and a monitoring and evaluation framework.

As part of a Joint Inter-sectoral Analysis Group (JIAG) led by OCHA, work continued on a joint inter-sectoral analysis framework. A comprehensive review of existing needs analysis frameworks was completed, including key characteristics it should encompass.

OCHA contributed to the development of the ECHO-supported Basic Needs Analysis (BNA) methodology. The BNA aims to support decision-making on multi-sectoral humanitarian response modalities, focusing on household and community level capacities and priorities for assistance. This will also inform the development of the joint intersectoral analysis framework.

OCHA, together with partners⁵, is part of the Governance Board of the Data Entry and Exploration Platform (DEEP). DEEP is an open-source initiative offering a structured way to compile and process secondary data for use in humanitarian needs analysis, while encouraging multi-stakeholders and inter-sectoral collaboration on analysis. The platform was piloted end-2017 and will be launched in 2018.

Pending further work by the IASC Task Team on the Humanitarian-Development Nexus, OCHA produced an internal guidance note for its Country Offices on joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors in protracted crisis contexts.

⁵ Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), the Assessment Capacities Project (ACAPS), the International Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and UNHCR.

To further enhance capacities on the coordination of needs assessment and inter-sectoral analysis, OCHA developed a competency framework and completed a competency gap analysis of field staff. The results were used to produce a Capacity Strengthening strategy identifying priority objectives and avenues for 2018-2022. The CAIM training was modified to align with the competency framework and better target actual OCHA staff responsibilities, and increase its relevance.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

The Theory of Change and M&E framework will be finalised with the partners.

The inter-sectoral analysis framework and approach will be further developed and tested. It will integrate into a 'Commitments for Needs Assessment' led by UNHCR and an ECHO-led study to develop quality criteria for needs assessments, both part of the Workstream.

The Capacity Building strategy devised to progressively strengthen OCHA's capacities in the coordination of assessments and analysis will be implemented. It envisages multi-pronged actions in trainings, coaching, staff secondment with partners, and knowledge management, which will require senior management backing and additional resources to implement. A mentoring approach focused on selected participants who have the potential to reach an advanced competency level will also be applied.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

While the inter-sectoral analysis model and approach are being developed with the JIAG, OCHA led collaborative inter-agency efforts to assess needs during sudden-onset emergencies in 2017. Partners were invited to contribute with data and information to produce a secondary data analysis in support to field teams during the response to hurricanes Irma and Maria in the Caribbean. Some 28 organizations including from the UN, Red Cross, regional disaster response agencies, NGOs and volunteer networks collaborated remotely to develop an initial understanding of the humanitarian situation⁶ and consolidate response data. The outputs fed directly into the Caribbean Region and Dominica Flash Appeals.

Given the Libya's limited field capacity, OCHA also convened JIAG partners⁷ to provide remote and in-country support for inter-sectoral analysis for the Humanitarian Needs Overview in Libya, and were mobilized to share data and help with the analysis of available information to support field teams in the Kasai region of the Democratic Republic of Congo.

⁶ The Assessment Capacities Project (ACAPS), WorldPop, the Global Education Cluster, the Global food security Cluster, IOM, UNOSAT, UNHCR, and WFP shared their data and helped with the analysis of available information to assist field teams.

⁷ These include REACH, IOM, Mapaction, JIPS, UNFPA, WFP, UNHCR, FAO, UNDP, UNICEF, UNMAS, WHO, WorldPop and Mercy Corps

In both Libya and DRC, the collaboration enabled to center the analysis around specific groups of people and specific crisis drivers, rather than along sectoral needs.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

In the absence of official inter-agency bodies focused on needs assessment and analysis, the Grand Bargain has facilitated greater collaboration and attention to this work.

The JIAG was established before the Grand Bargain but benefited from added momentum that fostered engagement, involvement of additional partners, and linkages with other priority activities in the Workstream.

Collaboration with partners on capacity strengthening was also facilitated by identifying common priorities coherent with Workstream commitments, and opportunities for joint trainings.

Exchanges were reinforced with a few key donors such as ECHO and DFID who showed strong commitment to the Workstream. Less progress was seen with other donors and development actors such as the World Bank.

Ensuring proper attention to gender considerations in the identification and analysis of needs has long been a focus among organizations working on joint and collaborative needs assessments. Emphasis continues to be placed on the collection of sex and age disaggregated data as feasible; and analysis of information in a manner that allows us to understand the different ways women, men, girls and boys are affected by and can influence the recovery from crises.

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Improve leadership and governance mechanisms at the level of the humanitarian country team and cluster/sector mechanisms to ensure engagement with and accountability to people and communities affected by crises.*
- 2. Develop common standards and a coordinated approach for community engagement and participation, with the emphasis on inclusion of the most vulnerable, supported by a common platform for sharing and analysing data to strengthen decision-making, transparency, accountability and limit duplication.*
- 3. Strengthen local dialogue and harness technologies to support more agile, transparent but appropriately secure feedback.*
- 4. Build systematic links between feedback and corrective action to adjust programming.*

Donors commit to:

- 5. Fund flexibly to facilitate programme adaptation in response to community feedback.*
- 6. Invest time and resources to fund these activities.*

Aid organisations commit to:

- 7. Ensure that, by the end of 2017, all humanitarian response plans – and strategic monitoring of them - demonstrate analysis and consideration of inputs from affected communities.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

See year 1 report

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

OCHA continues to work with UNICEF, IFRC and CDAC members on the Communication and Community Engagement Initiative (CCEI). It continues to support offices in CAR, Somalia, Chad and Yemen in establishing common services. OCHA has been working with donors, and with operational agencies, on these plans to ensure links are made with humanitarian decision-making.

OCHA worked with the IASC task team on a review of available tools and resources for achievement of AAP objectives.

A standby-partner was deployed to Somalia in 2017 to assess response-wide community engagement options and pull together community feedback, informing the HCT and inter-cluster mechanism.

More dedicated sections for community engagement (e.g. perceptions and information preference) were included in the 2017 HNOs and HRPs. The HNO scoring criteria has been updated to include more analysis of AAP. OCHA has worked with the IASC task team and REACH on ensuring community engagement questions are included in needs assessments to inform the HNO. This occurred for the first time in Ukraine in 2017.

In the Philippines, a pre-crisis mapping was done via the Community of Practice on Community Engagement (CE) to understand community perceptions and preferences in preparedness for disaster response. A community of practice in Asia Pacific continues to share best practice on collective community engagement following a regional workshop from high risk countries.

Research into common service models involving contact centres was undertaken, to inform the 2018 production of guidance on common operating models in support of common participation frameworks.

As part of its partnership with GSMA on the Humanitarian Connectivity Charter, OCHA has produced guidance on working with mobile network operators in field coordination; aiming for increased communications access for people affected by humanitarian disasters.

For the first time OCHA has included a chapter on community engagement in the UNDAC handbook, ensuring the rapid activation of community engagement activities in the coordination of sudden-onset emergencies and paving the way for coordinated feedback models. OCHA supported DFID's results frameworks by committing to incremental improvements in collective accountability by 2020.

The introduction of a specific section on Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) in the CERF project reporting template has provided CERF with valuable information on how AAP commitments have been considered in CERF-funded projects (this information is publicly available through the RC/HC reports posted on CERF's website). To ensure that AAP is embedded into the full cycle of CERF programming from the beginning, the CERF secretariat revised the CERF project application template in 2017 and included targeted questions on AAP.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

Work is ongoing for both the HRP and HNO scoring process including updating guidance for country offices, deploying coordinated contact centre guidance and continuing to increase/improve templates and frameworks on CE.

Capacity for the coordination of community engagement (both training and staffing) is being strengthened in 2018 with the inclusion of community engagement modules in OCHA's coordination training; the development of new modules focused on leadership and coordination of operational CE activities; and a strengthening of OCHA's current surge profiles. Standby Partner agencies have been engaged to increase staffing pools, deployment speeds and capacity of existing deployees.

A mapping of country-level coordination mechanisms for community engagement is underway to support the linkages of these more strategically to the humanitarian architecture in early 2018. Similarly, work will begin via the GCCG to map cluster-specific activities for community engagement and produce a strategy for collective services and leadership.

OCHA is co-leading a series of field workshops on operational planning for common mechanisms for community engagement, starting with Africa in May 2018. Following the Humanitarian Networks and Partnerships week 2018, various models for scalable common services are being produced by OCHA for use by CCEI partners and donors.

To facilitate analysis of information on AAP in CERF-funded projects and to provide clearer directions to CERF recipient agencies reporting on implementation, the CERF secretariat will revise the AAP section in the CERF reporting template in 2018. In addition, the next CERF results report will include an analysis of AAP in CERF-funded projects as reported in CERF RC/HC reports.

In the substantive revision of CBPF Global Guidelines planned for 2018, OCHA will reinforce the role and engagement of affected people in the programming, delivery and quality of aid. Options include promoting specific community engagement activities in project design, as well as mandatory community feedback mechanisms for CBPF-funded projects.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

In the Philippines, pre-crisis mapping has decreased community engagement planning and assessment time. Interagency support for national level platforms in Philippines and Bangladesh has reduced time for the subsequent activation of emergency mechanisms.

The adaptation of common service models from work done in Nepal has reduced production time for Yemen, CAR and Bangladesh, allowing proposals to reach donors faster.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Donor support for common services has led to an increase in buy-in for common accountability approaches. The inclusion of community engagement in interagency needs assessments have directly informed HNO and HRP information.

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding instruments and document the impacts on programme efficiency and effectiveness, ensuring that recipients apply the same funding arrangements with their implementing partners.*
2. *Support in at least five countries by the end of 2017 multi-year collaborative planning and response plans through multi-year funding and monitor and evaluate the outcomes of these responses.*
3. *Strengthen existing coordination efforts to share analysis of needs and risks between the humanitarian and development sectors and to better align humanitarian and development planning tools and interventions while respecting the principles of both.*

Multi-year planning and funding work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please report the percentage and total value of multi-year agreements⁸ you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.⁹ When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

See year 1 report

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

In 2017, OCHA's Planning and Monitoring Section (PAMS)/Programme Support Branch (PSB) supported the implementation of existing multi-year Humanitarian Response Plans (MYHRPs), namely in Democratic Republic of Congo, Chad, Central African Republic, Cameroon, Somalia, Sudan and Haiti. Support focused on strengthening monitoring and linkages with development programming. OCHA also supported the definition of new MYHRPs starting in 2018, i.e. oPt and Afghanistan. Among other things, support included updating an internal tip sheet for OCHA country offices providing recommendations and advice to countries embarking on multi-year processes, based on good practices and lessons learned. It also consisted of strengthening planning capacity, by including specific sessions on multi-year planning in the global HPC training in June 2017.

⁸ Multiyear funding is funding provided for two or more years based on a firm commitment at the outset

⁹ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

Several MYHRPs include strengthened gender analysis, by outlining how women and girls are differently affected by crises, and indicating concrete actions to address their specific needs. Among other measures, some MYHRP countries highlighted the increase of female participants in community consultations to inform project design and implementation, and improved monitoring and analysis of sex and age disaggregated data. In some contexts, strengthened gender integration in needs analysis, response planning and implementation is supported by a multi-year HCT strategy on gender equality in humanitarian action (Afghanistan) or by an inter-cluster humanitarian gender group (oPt).

As part of the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team work plan, OCHA Programme Support Branch and Resource Mobilization Branch, NRC and FAO commissioned a study on multi-year humanitarian financing. The study, "Living-up the Promise of Multi-Year Humanitarian Financing", explored ways to maximize the effect of multi-year humanitarian financing to enable greater efficiency and effectiveness. The report also highlighted existing challenges and proposed some practical recommendations going forward. The study was released in November 2017 and officially launched in February 2018

In September 2017, OCHA's Planning and Monitoring Section (PAMS)/Programme Support Branch (PSB) and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) supported the Government of Canada and UNICEF, co-conveners of the Grand Bargain work stream on Multi-Year Humanitarian Planning and Financing (MYHPF), to organize a global consultation workshop. The event was hosted by the Government of Canada's Permanent Mission to the UN in Geneva. Based on field experience and literature, the workshop aimed at sharing and consolidating good practices, challenges and lessons learned on MYHPF and defining priority areas for joint engagement going forward. Donors, UN entities, international NGOs, ICRC and Humanitarian Country Team representatives from five countries (Democratic Republic of Congo, Chad, Sudan, the occupied Palestinian territory, and Uganda) participated in the consultation and contributed to the discussion.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

In 2018, OCHA will continue to share good practices and to provide technical advice and support on multi-year planning in close coordination with inter-agency forums and relevant stakeholders. OCHA will also engage with UNICEF, co-convenor of the Grand Bargain work stream 7, to strengthen collective monitoring and accountability in countries with MYHRPs.

In doing so, OCHA will continue engaging with the IASC Task Team on the Humanitarian-Development Nexus (HDN) to strengthen synergies with development planning and programming in MYHRPs, with the Grand Bargain HDN and the Needs Assessments work streams, the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) and the IASC Task Team on Humanitarian Financing.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practice and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Close collaboration with the field has been key to guide OCHA's technical and advisory support on multi-year planning, which was grounded on good practices and lessons learned from different countries.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Jointly determine, on an annual basis, the most effective and efficient way of reporting on unearmarked and softly earmarked funding and to initiate this reporting by the end of 2017.*
2. *Reduce the degree of earmarking of funds contributed by governments and regional groups who currently provide low levels of flexible finance. Aid organisations in turn commit to do the same with their funding when channelling it through partners.*

Aid organisations commit to:

3. *Be transparent and regularly share information with donors outlining the criteria for how core and unearmarked funding is allocated (for example, urgent needs, emergency preparedness, forgotten contexts, improved management)*
4. *Increase the visibility of unearmarked and softly earmarked funding, thereby recognising the contribution made by donors.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Progressively reduce the earmarking of their humanitarian contributions. The aim is to aspire to achieve a global target of 30 per cent of humanitarian contributions that is non earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020¹⁰.*

Earmarking/flexibility work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please specify if possible the percentages of 2017 vs 2016 of:

- Unearmarked contributions (given/received)
- Softly earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Country earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Tightly earmarked contributions (given/received)

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

See year 1 report

¹⁰ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

2017 saw the largest unearmarked funding received through CERF. The fund received a record high income of \$513 million surpassing the \$450 million target by 63\$ million. This is an indicator of the trust placed in CERF in view of ever growing global humanitarian needs. In addition, a total of \$383 million was pledged for 2018 during the CERF High Level Conference in December. This is an increase of \$111 million compared to the amount pledged at the previous Conference.

CERF also received a first-time contribution from the generous practice of Zakat charitable giving by a foundation based in Oman on a multiyear basis – it represents a significant diversification of the donor base.

As part of efforts to build an investment case for CERF, the CERF secretariat published a briefing note entitled “Making the case for an investment in the Central Emergency Response Fund” in December 2017.

The full alignment of CBPF funding to the HRP, introduced in 2015 through new CBPF global guidelines, meant a need to determine an appropriate critical mass (fund size) to generate impact at the outcome level and, at the same time, maintain the cost-effectiveness of these funds. In 2016, as part of the WHS process, pooled funds emerged as an optimal instrument to channel un-earmarked (or “softly earmarked”) funding to prioritized humanitarian needs, and donors committed to support the target set by the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity to gradually increase to the portion of funding channelled through CBPFs to 15 per cent of the HRP funding requirements. In 2017, net contributions to CBPF increased to \$824 million (14.5% more than last year). This amount is still roughly 5 per cent of the combined HRP funding requirements in the 18 countries where CBPFs operate.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

OCHA established a new Humanitarian Financing and Resource Mobilization Division in 2018 that will increase OCHA’s capacity to drive more comprehensive resource mobilization efforts and collective action toward more efficient and sufficient financing for humanitarian action. This includes further expanding and diversifying the donor base for the pooled funds (CERF and CBPFs).

In 2018, the CERF secretariat will launch several initiatives aimed at supporting the achievement of the \$1 billion funding target and, by extension, a corresponding increase in unearmarked funding. These include, notably:

- Developing and advocating for a sound investment case to articulate the returns of a \$1 billion CERF in terms of results.

- Drawing on the success of the global funds and the historic World Bank IDA 18 replenishment, CERF will commission a review of global best practices in the development and use of the investment case.
- Mobilising political leadership and commitment required to promote the ownership towards contributing towards a \$1 billion CERF.
- Promoting evidence-based communication and advocacy to convey the added value of CERF through a multi-media communication strategy including digital and social media.
- Standardising and improving actions to promote donor visibility to better equip donors for the advocacy on unearmarked funding to CERF including for internal–budget processes.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

- Ensuring active and strategic use of “CERF Champions” including UN agencies, CERF recipient countries and CERF Advisory Group members as advocates for CERF.
- Engaging with private and innovative financing partners. This will include the launch of a multi-year cooperation with GIZ to raise funds from the private sector and philanthropic sources.
- Strengthening the strategic analysis of the global resource mobilisation landscape including donor priorities and decision-making processes.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2018 by reducing its volume, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.*
2. *Invest in technology and reporting systems to enable better access to information.*
3. *Enhance the quality of reporting to better capture results, enable learning and increase the efficiency of reporting.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

See year 1 report

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

In May 2017, CERF and Country Based Pooled Funds decided to support the two-year pilot initiative led by the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO) and ICVA to test the “Common 8+3” harmonized reporting template (elaborated by the Global Public Policy Institute, GPPI), in its CBPFs in Iraq, Myanmar, and Somalia. CBPFs informed its Humanitarian Financing Units (HFUs) in the respective OCHA Country Offices of this initiative and participation in the pilot and in parallel started working on necessary technical and structural adjustments to its Grant Management System (GMS) to reflect the reporting requirements in both project reporting and proposal formats. The revised reporting template was shared with the GFFO and GPPI and confirmed in its coherence with the “Common 8+3” requirements. OCHA also rolled out the Common Performance Framework for CBPFs developed in 2017.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

The revised reporting template is envisaged to be launched in February 2018. From the template’s GMS roll-out onwards, reporting across CBPFs (beyond pilot countries) will automatically be done through the “Common 8+3”-based reporting template. Eventual feedback from partners will be collected through Fund Managers and shared with the workstream leads, as appropriate.

Given the revised reporting template, OCHA is working on introducing an adapted project proposal template, which will in part automatically feed data into the reporting template, ease

partner reporting, and enable a better tracking and analysis of CBPF-funded interventions before progress or final reports become available. Roll-out and implementation of this revised proposal template is depending on technical GMS adjustments currently underway and expected to be finalized in Q3/2018.

In 2018, the CERF secretariat will roll out the revised reporting template of the harmonized reporting pilot across all countries where CERF allocates funding. In addition, CERF's efficiency taskforce will continue to identify and implement concrete ways to make the CERF application, review and reporting processes more efficient. CERF will implement the recommendations of the CERF efficiency taskforce for more efficient CERF processes and procedures.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Revising the CBPF reporting template was an opportunity not only for harmonization as per "Common 8+3", but also for further alignment with system-widely evolving terminology.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Sharing draft templates with both field and GFFO/GPPI colleagues for comments was a productive collaborative moment which further strengthened cooperation with the work stream leads.

Revising the project proposal based on the "Common 8+3"-aligned reporting template can be regarded a good practice for ensuring further coherence and advancing alignment beyond the common harmonized reporting requirements.

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Use existing resources and capabilities better to shrink humanitarian needs over the long term with the view of contributing to the outcomes of the Sustainable Development Goals. Significantly increase prevention, mitigation and preparedness for early action to anticipate and secure resources for recovery. This will need to be the focus not only of aid organisations and donors but also of national governments at all levels, civil society, and the private sector.*
2. *Invest in durable solutions for refugees, internally displaced people and sustainable support to migrants, returnees and host/receiving communities, as well as for other situations of recurring vulnerabilities.*
3. *Increase social protection programmes and strengthen national and local systems and coping mechanisms in order to build resilience in fragile contexts.*
4. *Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination in order to achieve a shared vision for outcomes. Such a shared vision for outcomes will be developed on the basis of shared risk analysis between humanitarian, development, stabilisation and peacebuilding communities.*
5. *Galvanise new partnerships that bring additional capabilities and resources to crisis affected states through Multilateral Development Banks within their mandate and foster innovative partnerships with the private sector.*

Humanitarian-Development engagement work stream co-conveners reporting request:

What has your organisation done to operationalise the humanitarian-development nexus at country level?"

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

See year 1 report

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

OCHA supported all countries with annual or multi-year HRPs to strengthen the synergies and linkages between humanitarian and development (and where appropriate stabilization) assistance within HRP response strategies. This consisted of advising country teams on how to

engage with development partners in joint needs analyses to have a common understanding of the situation and priorities, and in joined-up planning processes to enhance coherence and complementarity across international assistance and promote layered and sequenced approaches to programming.

In 2017, OCHA also contributed to advance the global discussion on the HDN. This included active participation and contributions to the IASC Task Team on the Humanitarian-Development Nexus (HDN) and to two regional workshops on the New Way of Working in Eastern and Southern Africa in Entebbe, Uganda in November-December 2017.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

OCHA will ensure its continued support to inter-agency processes and discussions on strengthening the HDN. It will also strengthen HDN messages and components in other internal guidance papers/tip sheets (e.g. multi-year planning, monitoring, etc.).

Being the role played by women and girls to ensure the livelihoods and resilience of their families and communities vital to humanitarian and development actions, OCHA will further strengthen its efforts to ensure humanitarian plans more clearly identify investments in women's capacity and empowerment. Linkages to development interventions and/or national gender equality frameworks/plans could further foster gender equality in the medium and long term.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Should we wish to provide some concrete country examples on the HDN (beyond OCHA, as collective results), we could mention the following:

Chad: to further strengthen synergies and coherence between humanitarian and development assistance, Chad established a High-Level Humanitarian-Development Forum co-chaired by the Minister of Economy and Development Planning and the RC/HC. Composed of the HCT, members of the development community, NGOs, government partners, and donors in June 2017 the forum endorsed joint operational priorities and six collective outcomes for humanitarian and development actors to be achieved by 2019. Collective outcomes were also presented at a High-level Roundtable on Financing Chad's National Development Programme 2017-2021 held in Paris in September 2017. The country also adopted a multi-year humanitarian planning approach, synchronized and harmonized with the UN Development Framework and the National Development Plan.

Somalia: towards the end of 2017, the humanitarian and development communities, in close collaboration with the Government, developed four collective outcomes (yet to be officially endorsed) as a way to ensure alignment and complementarity between the Resilience and Recovery Framework (RRF) and the HRP. These efforts were informed by the Drought Impact Needs Assessment (DINA), a joint analysis supported by the World Bank, the UN and the EU. Collective outcomes in Somalia focus on reducing the number of people in acute food insecurity; reducing the risk and vulnerability and increasing the resilience of IDPs; increasing the number of vulnerable people with equitable access to basic social services; and reducing the proportion of the population affected by climate-induced hazards. Somalia adopted a three-year humanitarian strategy in 2016 in the attempt to improve coherence and synergies across humanitarian and development assistance.